Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed on May 28, 2008, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks.

In the present application, claims 1, 3, 7, 11, 17-18, and 21 have been amended and claims 2, 5-6, 10, 16, and 19-20 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The claims have been amended to incorporate the features of the canceled claims and to clarify that the first instance of the menu command comprises a parent menu command located in the Extensible Web Part Menu, wherein a subsequent instance of the menu command comprises a child command located under the parent menu command, and wherein the child command is a duplicate of the parent menu command, if the determination is made to remove the first instance of the menu command, removing the parent menu command without removing the child command, and if the determination is made to remove the menu command from a particular location, then removing the menu command, wherein a DELETE command is prohibited from being removed from the Extensible Web Part Menu, thereby insuring the removal of unwanted or dangerous content imported into the Web Part using the DELETE command. Support for these claim amendments may be found in paragraphs 0065-0069 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Musson et al. (US 2005/0108647, hereinafter "Musson") in view of Sun Microsystems – "How to Use Menus," February 7, 2003, Sun Microsystems, Inc. (hereinafter "Sun").

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-21 are rejected as being unpatentable over Musson in view of Sun. Claims 2, 5-6, 10, 16, and 19-20 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejection of these claims moot. The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies a method for customizing an Extensible Web Part Menu comprising a plurality of commands, wherein each command comprises a plurality of characteristics rendered in a Web Part. The method includes overriding a method for rendering a default Extensible Web Part Menu in the Web Part, wherein overriding the method comprises:

calling a method to create a Web Part Menu, wherein the method is utilized to render a default Extensible Web Part Menu and; determining whether a menu override method has been inserted, wherein the menu override method comprises at least one call which may be utilized to modify the default Extensible Web Part Menu, wherein the menu override method does not overwrite the default Extensible Web Part menu, wherein if it is determined that a menu override command has been inserted, then deleting at least one command from the Extensible Web Part Menu, wherein deleting at least one command comprises: locating the command within an object model using at least one identifying indicia associated with the command; and removing the menu item from the command from the Extensible Web Part Menu, wherein removing the menu item from the command from the Extensible Web Part Menu comprises: determining whether to remove the first instance of the menu command from the Extensible Web Part Menu, wherein the first instance of the menu command comprises a parent menu command located in the Extensible Web Part Menu, wherein a subsequent instance of the menu command comprises a child command located under the parent menu command, and wherein the child command is a duplicate of the parent menu command; if the determination is made to remove the first instance of the menu command, removing the parent menu command without removing the child command; if the determination is made not to remove the first instance of the menu command, then making a determination whether the remove a menu item from a particular location in the Extensible Web Part Menu; if the determination is made to remove the menu command from a particular location, then removing the menu command, wherein a DELETE command is prohibited from being removed from the Extensible Web Part Menu, thereby insuring the removal of unwanted or dangerous content imported into the Web Part using the DELETE command; if the determination is made not to remove the menu command from a particular location, then removing all the menu commands from the Extensible Web Part Menu; and rendering the customized Extensible Web Part menu in the Web Part in a Web page on a client platform.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Musson and Sun fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each and every feature specified in amended claim 1. For example, the aforementioned combination fails to disclose that the first instance of the menu command comprises a parent menu command located in the Extensible Web Part Menu, wherein a subsequent instance of the menu command comprises a child command located under the parent

menu command, and wherein the child command is a duplicate of the parent menu command, if the determination is made to remove the first instance of the menu command, removing the parent menu command without removing the child command, and if the determination is made to remove the menu command from a particular location, then removing the menu command, wherein a DELETE command is prohibited from being removed from the Extensible Web Part Menu, thereby insuring the removal of unwanted or dangerous content imported into the Web Part using the DELETE command.

Musson discusses rendering a portal graphical user interface (GUI) by providing for the representation of a GUI desktop and a GUI book as a set of controls. The controls can be organized in a logical hierarchy for traversing the representation. The representation may be traversed by associating a theme with a first control in the set of controls, rendering the first control according to the theme, and rendering any descendants of the first control according to the theme. The descendants can override the them and the set of controls can communicate with another set of controls. See Abstract.

Sun discusses code for creating menus including a menu API which includes constructors or methods for removing specified menu items and, if the argument in the constructor or method is an integer, specifying the position of the menu item to be removed. See pages 8-9.

In the Office Action, it is conceded that Musson fails to disclose deleting at least one command from the Extensible Web Part Menu, as specified in amended claim 1. Sun is relied on for curing this deficiency of Musson. Sun however, fails to disclose that the first instance of the menu command comprises a parent menu command located in the Extensible Web Part Menu, wherein a subsequent instance of the menu command comprises a child command located under the parent menu command, and wherein the child command is a duplicate of the parent menu command, if the determination is made to remove the first instance of the menu command, removing the parent menu command without removing the child command, and if the determination is made to remove the menu command from a particular location, then removing the menu command, wherein a DELETE command is prohibited from being removed from the Extensible Web Part Menu, thereby insuring the removal of unwanted or dangerous content imported into the Web Part using the DELETE command, as specified in amended claim 1. In contrast, Sun merely discusses removing specified items from a menu and specifying the position

of the menu item to be removed if the argument of the item is an integer. Thus, Sun fails to disclose parent and child menu commands as specified in amended claim 1. Sun further fails to disclose that the child command is located under the parent menu command or the child command is a duplicate of the parent command. Sun also fails to disclose that the parent menu command may be removed without removing the child or duplicate menu command. Finally, Sun fails to disclose prohibiting the removal of a DELETE command.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Musson and Sun fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended claim 1. Therefore, amended claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, and 9 depend from amended claim 1 and thus specify at least the same features. Therefore, these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons and the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Amended independent claims 11 and 21 specify similar features as amended claim 1 and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore the rejection of this claim should also be withdrawn. Claims 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, and 18 depend from amended claim 11 and thus are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD LLC.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5064

Date: August 7, 2008

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III
Reg. No. 47,299

3358057-1   14